IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

Dale Joseph Burke,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
VS.)	
)	
North Dakota Department of Correction)	Case No. 1:12-cv-131
and Rehabilitation, et. al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

On December 21, 2012, plaintiff filed a "Motion for Court Order to Have the Following Persons Charged with Criminal Violation of Conspiracy Against Rights Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 241." He asserts that several employees of the North Dakota Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation are harassing him, retaliating against him for initiating the above-entitled action, and otherwise engaging in criminal conduct. He requests that the court order the United States Attorney's Office to investigate and criminal prosecute these employees.

Private citizens have no constitutional or other right to a criminal investigation. See Linda R.S. v. Richard D., 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973) ("a private citizen lacks a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or nonprosecution of another"); see also Smith v. Shaw, No. 5:09–01001, 2012 WL 1832340, at * 1 (S.D. W.Va. April 25, 2012) (citing United States v. Oguaju, 76 F.App'x 579, 581 (6th Cir.2003); Hester v. West Virginia, 2008 WL 4298471, * 6 (S.D.W.Va.), Powell v. Kopman, 511 F. Supp. 700, 704 (S.D.N.Y. 1981), for the proposition that a violation of a federal statute does not provide for a private cause of action). Moreover, the court does not have the authority to direct that an individual be prosecuted. See United States v. Batchelder, 442 U.S. 114,

124 (1979) (stating that the decision whether to prosecute and what charges to file rest in the

prosecutor's discretion); see also Inmates of Attica Corr. Facility v. Rockefeller, 447 F.2d 375 (2nd

Cir. 1973) (finding that the authority to investigate and initiate criminal complaints rest exclusively

with the United States Attorney); Young v. Harold, No. Civ.A. 04CV245WOB, 2005 WL 1048117,

at *8 (E.D. Ky. May 3, 2005) (opining that federal courts have not authority to initiate criminal

proceedings).

Based on the foregoing, undersigned **RECOMMENDS** that the court **DENY** plaintiff's

"Motion for Court Order to Have the Following Persons Charged with Criminal Violation of

Conspiracy Against Rights Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 241" (Docket No. 14).

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO FILE OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to D.N.D. Civil L.R. 72.1(D)(3), any party may object to this recommendation

within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of this Report and Recommendation.

Failure to file appropriate objections may result in the recommended action being taken without

further notice or opportunity to respond.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 8th day of January 2012.

/s/ Charles S. Miller, Jr.

Charles S. Miller, Jr., Magistrate Judge

United States District Court

2